

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

13th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XIII, Number 19

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

November 15, 1983

## *Academic Money Hunters*

### How Two Lobbyists Work the Washington Scene

*The Washington end of academic politics has been in an uproar since last spring when, without prior discussion, the House suddenly voted rare construction money for laboratories at the Catholic University of America and Columbia University (SGR Vol. XIII, No. 10).*

*Inquiry revealed that the coup, which set off a wave of unsuccessful attempts at imitation, was the work of two for-hire lobbyists, Kenneth Schlossberg and Gerald S.J. Cassidy. Their namesake company represents a wide array of industrial organizations and universities, including, besides the aforementioned, Tufts, Boston University, Boston College, Indiana University, Northwestern, plus several small colleges.*

*Veterans of extensive service on Capitol Hill and other Washington arenas, Schlossberg and Cassidy have acquired a reputation for, as one highly annoyed federal research administrator put it, "making buildings appear." SGR talked to the pair on November 9, starting with Cassidy, and Schlossberg later joining in. Following is a partial transcript, edited by SGR for brevity and clarity.—DSG*

*SGR. What do you charge a university for your services?*

Cassidy. All I'll give you is a ballpark answer. We work on a retainer, let's say between \$25,000 and \$120,000 a year. It depends on how much of our time is involved. The fee is going to be different for representing a big state system and representing a tiny college. The fee is different depending on how sophisticated they are in what they're already doing in Washington, or

### **300 Expected at Rev. Moon's Annual Science Conference—Page 8**

whether we're going to be responsible for everything in the world. It also depends on whether they want to establish a public-relations presence in Washington. Universities are practically all involved in capital campaigns. We work with them on the campaigns. Part of the success of their capital campaigns is the prestige of their president. They are the fundraisers. How they are seen, how much they're seen in the public light has an impact on what the university is able to do [in raising funds].

*SGR. Do you shepherd a university president around Washington?*

Cassidy. Sure. We introduce them to people. We create perhaps a breakfast on the Hill where they can meet with people. Sometimes we'll have a breakfast or a lunch with alumni in the area up there. A member will sponsor it who's an alumnus of the university or a friend of it.

*SGR. Which presidents have you done this for?*

Cassidy. We did it for Father Byron [President of Catholic University].

*SGR. For Jean Mayer [President of Tufts]?*

Cassidy. Yeah, we've done that, but not for years. When he first started, it was something that we did quite often. He's a very well-known figure. We still do things. We go to meetings with him, we set up meetings.

*SGR. [Robert] Silber [President of Boston University]?*

Cassidy. Sure.

*SGR. Who did you arrange for Silber to meet?*

*(Continued on page 2)*

## **In Brief**

With all five of his top lieutenants voluntarily gone or going, and as yet unreplaced, Presidential Science Adviser George A. Keyworth is reported to be reorganizing his domain, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, according to his spokesman. The jurisdictions of the four assistant directorships will be changed, and some new ones may be added, we're told. No word, though, on plans for the vacant post of Deputy Director.

*The departures, all in about one year, have naturally set the gossip mills rolling, but, as SGR has noted previously, there's no common denominator to the outflow.*

Meanwhile, Keyworth has expressed a bit of pique at what he sees as the scientific community's failure to express gratitude for the Reagan Administration's plump budgets for basic research. Speaking November 2 to the annual meeting of the National Academy of Engineering, Keyworth—a prime influence in making those budgets—*noted that the Administration was initially criticized for switching energy-technology funds to basic research. "But attitudes are different now," he said, "and the wisdom of those changes—resulting in today's strong growth for basic research—is even being applauded, quietly, of course."*

## ...Making Use of Institution's Political Ties

(Continued from page 1)

Cassidy. Quite a few people.

**SGR.** *Your work for Catholic and Columbia universities produced good results for them and a lot of criticism. Let's start with Catholic. What did you do for them on the materials lab?*

Cassidy. When we first met with Father Byron, he cataloged what he thought were the university's most pressing needs. One of them was a new facility for the Vitreous State Lab, an excellent lab, but it's overflowing. We said we thought it might be something that's pursuable, that over a period of years we might generate interest in it. Early in the year, there was a lot of controversy about NCAM [a proposed National Center for Advanced Materials Research, to be located at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, California]. And it sparked Father Byron's interest. He asked if this doesn't fit in that same subject area, and if it can be pursued. And we set off on a series of meetings with members [of Congress]. I accompanied Father Byron with a description of what the laboratory is, some impressive letters from people about it—scientists, industrialists.

### Moving Fast

**SGR.** *Why didn't you go to the Department of Energy, which would be providing the funds?*

Cassidy. I think it was just a case of moving so fast. Were I to do it over again, I would go to the Department of Energy. But we went to the Hill, to the people on the Energy Committee, we went to [Senator J.] Bennett Johnston (D-La.), who is the ranking Democrat on both Energy Appropriations and the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, spoke to him about it. Father Byron had the advantage of having known him when Father Byron was at Loyola University [in New Orleans]. We went to Mrs. [Lindy] Boggs [Congresswoman, New Orleans], and she is the ranking Democrat on House Appropriations.

**SGR.** *What was your role?*

Cassidy. What we provided was an idea how to put together the proposal, what the sequence would be. We were monitoring the process, talking to the staff people. The kinds of things that a university president doesn't

### Schlossberg & Cassidy

In business since 1975, when they set up shop as Schlossberg-Cassidy and Associates, the two lobbyists, like many in that crowded field in Washington, have backgrounds in journalism, law, and Congressional staff work.

Schlossberg, who received a Columbia master's degree in journalism in 1962, was a reporter from 1964-66 on the now-defunct *Washington Daily News*. He then served with the Office of Economic Opportunity, and from 1970-75 was Staff Director of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

Cassidy, after graduation from Cornell Law School in 1967, served for two years with a migrant legal services program in Florida. After that he joined the Senate Committee on Nutrition, where he served as General Counsel until 1975, with time out as Executive Director and General Counsel of the Reform Commission of the Democratic National Committee.

have the time to do. And really what some wealthier universities, with very large staffs here in town do. Why do some universities have fairly large offices here—two or three people? The University of California has that.

**SGR.** *How did the Speaker [Tip O'Neill] get involved with the grant for Catholic University?*

Cassidy. The trustees are bishops. It came about because Father Byron asked his trustees to call members. And the late Cardinal Madeiros [Archbishop of Boston] was one of the trustees. He had someone on his staff call someone on the Speaker's staff, and the legend grew that Cardinal Madeiros called the Speaker late one evening. But that's how it happened. Father Byron knows the Speaker, and the Speaker is an active Catholic, and that's the Catholic University.

**SGR.** *Was your representation of Columbia a one-shot deal for the chemistry laboratory, or is that a continuing relationship?*

(Continued on page 3)

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1983

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher  
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher  
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager  
Margaret Lee

Contributing Correspondents

Christopher Joyce (Washington); Francois Seguer (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except in January, July & August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$144.00 (two years, \$255.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. Nw., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

## AAU, Academy Deplore Politicking and Extol Peer Review

Final passage of the Catholic and Columbia appropriations provided \$10 million as downpayments on construction priced at \$34 million for the two labs. And it also provided the impetus for other universities to shortcircuit the slow and orthodox route of departmental review in favor of direct appeal to Capitol Hill. None of these follow-on efforts made it all the way through the legislative mill—though nearly \$100-million worth did gain Senate approval. But that was enough to set off alarms among the devotees—who are also the steady beneficiaries—of the status quo.

On October 25, the Association of American Universities—a trade association mainly of big research universities—adopted a resolution urging “scientists, leaders of America’s universities and Members of Congress to support the practice of awarding funds for the support of science on the basis of scientific merit, judged in an objective and informed manner.” With 45 of the AAU’s members in attendance, passage was “nearly unanimous.” Among the dissenters was Columbia, which took the position that peer review of facilities should also consider the economic implications of laboratory facilities.

On October 30, the Governing Council of the Na-

tional Academy of Sciences took a similar position in a statement noting that “In recent months, there have been a few instances in which federal funding decisions for major university scientific facilities have not been subject to an appropriate review process.”

The pontificating of the grant-laden “haves” merits a gusher of cynical commentary about their deification of a system that assures their success and virtually excludes newcomers. The AAU is there to lobby for them on a group basis; several maintain Washington outposts to get a jump on the competition, and others regularly send emissaries to Washington to sniff for money. Though peer review is usually a common hurdle for all, the well-informed rich approach it with the advantage of skillfully collected and analysed information.

But we will merely note that big academe is in good stead with Congress these days and has had little difficulty in getting its message across. The leaders on Capitol Hill have passed the word that lab facilities are generally out of bounds for pork-barrel ploys, and that prior approval by research agencies should be in hand before Congress is asked to provide money for science.

## ...Assessing Columbia University's Needs

(Continued from page 2)

Cassidy. Continuing.

*SGR. Columbia is a sophisticated place with good Washington connections, and they know their way around. What can you do for them?*

Cassidy. They're not here full time. They have a very sophisticated Vice President for Government Relations, Greg Fusco, a guy who used to be with Senator Javits. The person we work with most at the university is also a very sophisticated Washington type, Dr. Bob Goldberger [formerly Deputy Director for Science at the National Institutes of Health]. Bob was the head of a big part of NIH before he went up to Columbia. The Dean of the Medical School, Bob Levy, is also a Washington type; he was the head of the Heart Institute at NIH.

*SGR. What do you do for Columbia?*

Schlossberg. We sit down with them and discuss what they're government-relations program is. We discuss what their general level of research activity is in terms of grants and contracts, what their needs are for facilities and what might be available from a variety of sources. Sometimes we discuss how they're doing on private fundraising and what we might be able to do for them there. That discussion starts with the administra-

tion of the university and then goes through various departments and faculties. Then we try to come to some sort of assessment of strengths and weaknesses and how they can improve their government-relations program. If they have a particular strength and there's a particular federal interest, we try to explain how those interests match up. If they don't have a match but are interested in an area, then we explain what they need to do to get into that area and what that could lead to in the future in terms of research funding.

*SGR. Columbia is number eight in the top 100 of university recipients of federal R&D money. Why do they need additional help?*

Schlossberg. In the chemistry area, in particular, they're generally regarded to have one of the finest departments, though not one of the largest, in the country; in organic chemistry, perhaps the finest department of all, but they have very old facilities. They have found, like many other institutions, that it is very difficult to get private donors for the amount it takes to build a first-class research facility. So, that was one of their pressing needs.

*SGR. Did they apply to the Department of Energy or*  
(Continued on page 4)

## ...Get Money for East Coast, Senator Said

(Continued from page 3)  
*the National Science Foundation?*

Schlossberg. My understanding is that they had investigated, over some period of time, the availability of funds for facilities. They were basically told that there were no funds available for facilities. So, they were essentially discouraged from initiating any application.

Cassidy. This is really one of the problems that is unstated. The backlog of university needs is simply enormous, even putting aside deferred maintenance, which is a big thing at Columbia. And if you deal with what universities need to become first class, to deal with the competition from Japan and elsewhere, the government, at some time, has to decide that it wants to go back to making funds available that the schools can apply for. There aren't funds out there. It's like applying for a loan at a bank that has no money.

*SGR. Nevertheless, you found money.*

Cassidy. There isn't money and there is money.

Schlossberg. One of the first things we do is investigate what is the actual situation. What are the departments that have authority in the area. What have been the appropriations under the authority. What are the differences between budget authority and actual appropriations.

*SGR. Did you investigate DoE and conclude that there's no money there, and then go to the Hill?*

Cassidy. No, what we did was investigate DoE and conclude there was money. The money wasn't being completely allocated. The difference between the authority in the basic science area and what has been appropriated in that area is simply enormous.

### Unused Funds

*SGR. DoE is sitting on unused money?*

Cassidy. They've got the authorizations and they have to ask for the appropriations, but they're not asking for it. There's something like a \$635-million standing authorization for basic research, and they're not even close to appropriating to that level. They're around \$300 million below that. Clearly somebody has been missing the boat. But with the country and the Congress reflecting concern about the nation's technological status, it is incredible to me that we have that much [budget] authority lying around, and no major effort being made to get the Congress to understand that they can appropriate the funds.

*SGR. So, what did you do?*

Schlossberg. We met with [Columbia President Michael] Sovern; Bob Goldberger, who is the new Provost, and Greg Fusco, the Director of Government Relations. We sat down and said, "This is the way it looks to us. We think we could make an effort on your

behalf to seek funding a chemistry facility by trying to go through several agencies, and DoE would be one of them." They then decided to go ahead.

*SGR. What was the process you followed?*

Schlossberg. There's been a lot of misunderstanding that says we tried some kind of endrun around the [Congressional] authorization process. That was not our intention. If we had understood the situation as we understood it later, we would have contacted the authorization committee [House Science and Technology], probably at the same time that we contacted the Appropriations Committee. But we had determined that there had been no authorization passed for DoE by Congress and signed by the President for two or three years. And there was not likely to be one this year. What we understood to be the case was that there was the standing authorization and that was what the Appropriations Committee was operating under. On that basis, we assumed that the only process that was at work was the appropriations process. Now, what do you do when you're representing an institution? The first thing you do is you contact the members that represent the institution [in Congress]—in this case [US Rep.] Charlie Rangel, who represents Columbia, and he was one of the first we got in touch with. On the other side, we saw Senators D'Amato and Moynihan. And we saw several other New York Congressmen. Pat Moynihan's response was something like, "Well, I read they're going to send all this money out to California to Berkeley. It seems to me that we ought to balance that off with something for the East Coast." The members then proceeded to make their contacts with members on Appropriations committees.

Cassidy. In each of these situations, we're talking about funds that, had the schools not applied to Congress, simply wouldn't be appropriated. It's money spent on science that would not have been spent otherwise. So, it's really a positive addition to the whole national effort. No one is going to be hurt. The economy is only going to be improved by the fact that Columbia has an organic chemistry laboratory, that right here in Washington there's a new Vitreous State Laboratory.

### AAU and Academy Protests

*SGR. The Association of American Universities and the National Academy of Sciences don't see it that way. These episodes contributed to their recent statements endorsing peer review as the best means for awarding funds.*

Schlossberg. I think the best system is a mixed system. I don't think there's anything wrong with members of Congress taking an interest in a particular

(Continued on page 5)



## ...Keyworth "Should Have Hired Us" to Get Funds

(Continued from page 4)

project. There's nothing that says Congressional activities aren't going to produce as good a result as the peer-review process might produce. I don't think anything we've ever done, or would do, could result in a \$200-million mistake such as occurred at the Brookhaven Laboratory through the peer-review system [a reference to the recent decision to terminate construction of a new accelerator]. I don't think anything we could ever do could produce as negative a report as was produced by the commission that [Presidential Science Adviser George A.] Keyworth set up to study the national laboratory system. That's all peer review. I'm not condemning peer review. It's not perfect; maybe what we're doing isn't perfect. But I don't think what we're doing is bad, because I would take any one of the projects that we've worked on and I would defend them. Almost all of our projects, after Congressional approval, go through peer reviews organized by the departments. If they were "dogs" they would not be approved by all those expert panels in the departments.

### A Closed System

Cassidy. If they really want a competitive system, they should let some of these other institutions get some funds to have facilities to compete with them. It would be different if these great institutions had raised every dime of their funds on the outside. But when you're talking about winning these great national laboratories for your institution, much of that was done at a time when no one else was in the game, and it advantaged them for the rest of time. If no one else is able to get facilities, which is the case, then it's a closed system. And who's on the peer-review panels? It's a small group. These programs that we've worked with increase the capacity out there. And they'll be fine programs.

*SGR. Are you suggesting that the AAU is a rich-man's club trying to protect the status quo?*

Cassidy. I won't disagree with that.

*SGR. Keyworth isn't happy with your work.*

Cassidy. He should have hired us. We would have gotten him his money [for the Berkeley materials laboratory, which Congress has delayed].

*SGR. What do you do for Tufts?*

Schlossberg. When I was with the Senate Nutrition Committee, I got to know Jean Mayer. After he got to be President of Tufts, he said he wanted to try to follow up with research on the effectiveness of the nutrition programs that we had started in Congress. He said he wanted to have the world's finest human-nutrition laboratory, and he asked me to investigate the possibility. We got an idea that it was feasible. We established a strategy. We worked with the Department of

Agriculture and members of Congress to develop a research facility [at a cost of \$34 million].

*SGR. What do you do for John Silber [President of Boston University]?*

Cassidy. We advise him on public relations, capital funding, legislation down here.

Schlossberg. It's an across-the-board service. He considers it very valuable. One specific project is a very complex affair involving a large piece of land that sits right in the middle of his campus, a 14-acre site of a National Guard armory. At one of our first meetings, he asked whether it would be possible to put together a team consisting of the university, the Governor and his executive departments, and Washington—the Massachusetts [Congressional] delegation, and the National Guard, to come up with a plan that would suit everybody's needs. The Washington end came down to this: the Commander of the National Guard up there said this is how much we need to build new facilities. We investigated what Massachusetts had received over the last 10 years for National Guard facilities and we determined that they had received precious little—almost nothing, as compared to the rest of the country. There was a backlog that Massachusetts could apply for. We then negotiated with the parties, and over a period of years, we obtained \$10 million in federal National Guard armory construction funds. Based on that, we worked with the Governor and the State Legislature—we were serving as consultants to a particular lobbyist in the state who actually did the lobbying in the Legislature. We succeeded at the beginning of this year, and the process is now being concluded. It's something that they couldn't get done for 20 years, and we actually were able to figure out how to get it done in two years.

### "Which is More Pure?"

*SGR. Your customers' retainers come back many-fold?*

Cassidy. In every case, many, many-fold. We work very hard. I started this morning at a 6:45 meeting with some people.

*SGR. What are you doing with Northwestern University?*

Cassidy. We're in the process of working with them to develop a government-relations program—to decide what they're going to do.

*SGR. And Indiana?*

Cassidy. A big part of what we're doing with them is a capital drive for their department of education.

*SGR. Do you think the controversy raised by your successes is going to put a roadblock in your way?*

Cassidy. I don't think so. I don't even expect that the

(Continued from page 6)

## In Print: "5-Year Outlook," R&D Directory, Etc.

*The Five-Year Outlook on Science and Technology 1982*, produced by the National Academy of Sciences for NSF, this is the third in a series of crystal-ball efforts mandated by Congress to prod the Executive Branch toward long-range thinking about research; subjects include genetics, cell receptors, psychobiology, surface sciences, lasers, robots, and fluid dynamics. (85 pages, \$5, Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402. Request Stock No. 038-000-00530-8.)

*Research Centers Directory*, 8th edition of what is probably the most complete guide to university and other non-profit research organizations in the US and Canada. Covers 16 disciplines, for a total of 6300 entries, each including formal name and address of organization, phone number, director's name and title, sources of support, etc. (1082 pages, \$225, Gale Research Co., Book Tower, Detroit, Michigan 48226; tel. 313/961-2242.)

*Abstracts of Case Studies in the Health Technology Case Study Series* (of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment) describes 24 reports produced in OTA's long-running study of health-care cost-effectiveness. The subjects include end-stage renal dialysis, the artificial heart, alcoholism treatment, and elective hysterectomy. (39 pages, no charge, available from Office of Technology Assessment, US Congress, Washington, DC 20510; tel. 202/224-8996.)

### LOBBYING

(Continued from page 5)

members of AAU are going to give up their own interest or allow their decisions to be made by anyone else but themselves.

Schlossberg. Listen. When it comes to being pure as the driven snow, you explain to me which is more pure: Columbia needs a chemistry building very badly; there's no place to go for the money. It's a national resource. They take a legal, ethical route to do it, and they do well with it. Or, AAU proposing that everybody in the country should support a bill [S. 1537, to increase funding for basic research in universities], introduced by Senator [John C.] Danforth (R-Mo.), whose brother [William Danforth, Chancellor of Washington University] is the past chairman of the AAU. I'm not against the Danforth bill. Part of the problem is ignorance, even in the educational community, about what the Congress is and what it's capable of doing. Many people in the educational associations have an Executive Branch view of the US government. They think all that Congress is supposed to do is receive the budget requests and priorities of the executive agencies and decide it can only afford to spend 50 percent of what they want, and they think

Also by OTA, *An Assessment of Maritime Trade and Technology*, produced for House Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and on Ways and Means, finds, among many other failings, a lack of policy and focus for R&D supported by the US Maritime Administration, and notes that "there is no rationale for the selection of projects as worthy of Federal support while others are left for industry or some other research enterprise." (231 pages, \$6.50, Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402. Request Stock No. 052-003-00931-5.)

*Academic Science, Higher Education, and the Federal Government, 1950-1983*, by John T. Wilson, a psychologist who joined NSF in 1952, served as Deputy Director 1963-68 and then to the University of Chicago, where he was Provost and, 1975-78, President. Wilson provides a concise sketch of the evolution of science-and-government relations, and concludes with fire and brimstone not heard in academic circles for many years: "...those responsible for higher education must also recognize its purposes and be willing to defend them and the standards that are necessary to attain them, even at the risk of dissolving all relationships with the federal government. To do otherwise risks becoming simply an instrument of the federal government." (Publication date December 13, 116 pages, \$3.50 paperback, \$10 clothbound, University of Chicago Press.)

that's the beginning and the end of the Congress's legitimate interest.

*SGR. It's argued that peer review assures proper distribution of the money.*

Cassidy. I don't want to get into criticizing peer review. It's something that they established and that has been of benefit. But for schools that have ambitions to be better and are willing to commit to the effort, it's difficult to break through the system, because the "haves" have. It's also a question of sophistication, and this isn't to be self-serving—that we're sophisticated and the university people aren't. You take somebody like Ted Litovitz [Director of the Catholic University research program], who really is a marvelous scientist. He for years has been pursuing research, but when we spoke to him he simply had no idea that he could get facilities from the Energy Department. Nobody had ever brought it up to him; he had never talked about it. So, he was one step away from the process, and that was the knowledge that he could do it. Father Byron and I provided him with the knowledge that it could be done. We provided the service in following through and carrying out Father Byron's wishes. The difference is in knowing what can be done.

## In the Works: Studies at Institute of Medicine

*The following is another entry in SGR's occasional inventories of major studies in Washington-based policy-research organizations. This one reports on some of the work underway or planned at the Institute of Medicine, the health-policy arm of the National Academy of Sciences. The study directors listed for each project are fulltime members of the IoM staff; chairmen are IoM members and usually are based elsewhere. For additional information: IoM, 2101 Constitution Ave., Nw., Washington, DC 20418; tel 202/334-2000.*

***The National Institutes of Health: Mission and Structure.*** Chairman, James Ebert; Study Director, Michael Stoto. Initiated last March as a foil against Congressional impatience with NIH's pace and priorities in disease research, the study was requested and financed by NIH. It is not likely to cause weeping in Bethesda. Completion date: October 1984.

***Evaluating Medical Technologies in Clinical Use.*** Chairman, Frederick Mosteller; Study Director, Enriqueta Bond. Started in January 1981, this is an especially timely study, given the proliferation of medical technologies and the Reagan Administration's evisceration of budgets for health-technology assessment. Sponsored by the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and the National Research Council. Completion date: December 1983.

***Issues and Priorities for New Vaccine Development.*** Chairman, Samuel Katz; Study Director, Roy Widdus. The study, which commenced in September 1982, is examining priorities for vaccine development, safety and efficacy testing, and availability of industrial producers. Separate reports on domestic and international aspects are scheduled. Sponsored by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. Completion date: October 1984.

***Public/Private Sector Relations in Vaccine Innovation.*** Chairman, Jay Sanford; Study Director, Roy Widdus. Initiated in May 1983, the study is looking at the various institutional participants in vaccine development and production. Sponsored by the Academy, the Centers for Disease Control, FDA, US Army, Lederle Labs, Merck, Sharp and Dohme, and Merieux Institute. Completion date: December 1984.

***Behavioral Research and Training Issues Related to the Secret Service.*** Chairman, Walter Menninger; Study Director, Michael McGeary. This study, requested and supported by the Secret Service, grew out of a conference held in 1981 on "Behavioral Research and the

Secret Service: Problems in Assessing and Managing Dangerous Behavior." A final report will include recommendations "on how the Secret Service might institutionalize a capacity to use behavioral science knowledge and methods in its research and training efforts." Completion date: January 1984.

***Health Consequences of the Stress of Bereavement.*** Chairman, Morris Green; Study Director, Marian Osterweis. This study, which began in October 1982, is examining the "conventional wisdom" that bereavement increases vulnerability to mental and physical illness. Support is by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Completion date: April 1984.

***The Future of Academic Psychiatry.*** Still in the formative stages, with Chairman and Study Director to be selected, this study was requested by the Director of NIMH to examine "the future of the functions currently performed by medical school departments of psychiatry." The study is expected to begin in January 1984 and run for 18 months.

***US Capacity to Address Tropical Disease Problems.*** Karen Bell serves as Study Director for this project, which is still in the formative stages. The estimated duration is 18 months. Support is being discussed with several government agencies and private foundations.

***Prevention of Low Birthweight in Infants.*** Chairman, Richard Behrman; Study Director, Sarah Brown. Sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the NAS. Started April 1983; completion date: May 1984.

### Subscription Form

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$144.00 ☐

two years, \$255.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$25.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

## Moon Group Holding 12th Science Meeting

The Rev. Sun Myung Moon's 12th annual goldplated bash for scientists and other scholars will take place November 25-27 at the Chicago Marriott Hotel on the theme of "Absolute Values and the New Cultural Revolution."

The Honorary Chairman of this year's gathering is Eugene P. Wigner, the retired Nobel laureate Princeton physicist. Wigner, associated with the meetings since their inception, received a \$200,000 "founder's award" from Moon at last year's meeting. According to a press release from the forthcoming meeting's organizers, "At Dr. Wigner's request, a committee was formed to dispense the money to various research and charitable foundations."

The conferences are sponsored by the International Cultural Foundation, a branch of Moon's Unification Church, which pays the expenses for participants from around the world. The meetings usually attract 300-500 participants at an estimated cost in recent years of about \$1 million per annual get-together.

The Organizing Chairman for the Chicago meeting is Morton A. Kaplan, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for Strategic and Foreign Policy Studies, University of Chicago. The Vice Chairman is Alvin M. Weinberg, Director of the Institute for Energy Analysis and former Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The first few of these meetings became enmeshed in controversies about Moon's allegedly rough methods of recruiting young followers. With aggrieved parents leading the way, serious picketing was common at these sessions, and some scientists whose names were associated with the earlier meetings quickly dropped out when public inquiries were made about their involvement. Moon was accused of being less interested in "unifying" the sciences than in gaining respectability by mingling with scientific celebrities.

Nonetheless, year after year, the meetings have attracted a following that includes many persons of scientific distinction. An often-stated rationale for participation is that the subject is important and Moon alone is providing support for conferring on it.

In any case, familiarity has rendered Moon and his

### *Parapsychology Session*

With a good deal of skittishness about ridicule, an industry-owned "think tank," Kaman Tempo, of Alexandria, Va., is quietly inviting government researchers to a closed conference on parapsychology November 30-December 1.

The conference is titled "Application of Anomalous Phenomena," which concerns, SGR is advised, uses that might be made of alleged phenomena—such as extra-sensory perception—for which there is no conventional explanation. The sponsor is aiming for an attendance of about 60 persons. The meeting will be held at the Xerox International Center, Leesburg, Va., but Xerox has no substantive connection with the proceedings.

Kaman Tempo is a division of Kaman Sciences, which is part of the Kaman Corp., a high-tech conglomerate that ranges from helicopters to guitars.

Parapsychology has no standing in the official listings of government-supported research (SGR Vol. XIII, No. 16). But it has its followers—ranging from respectful agnostics to fervent missionaries—in the federal science bureaucracy.

Rumors persist that defense agencies are involved in so-called psi research, particularly in "remote viewing," defined as the ability to see things that are normally beyond seeing. SGR has encountered several mentions of the Defense Intelligence Agency. But we have nothing firm to report. An inquiry to a military officer who's said to be knowledgeable about what, if any, Defense Department involvement exists, produced the following: "The Defense Department position is to neither confirm nor deny any interest in this subject."

various enterprises considerably less provocative to conventional American sensibilities than they were a dozen years ago. The annual meetings still draw an expenses-paid crowd from around the world—300 from 80 countries are forecast for the Chicago meeting; but hardly anybody else pays much attention these days.

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

Xerox-University Microfilms  
300 N. Zeeb Rd  
Ann Arbor

MI 48106

9999



